



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| 10/566,836 | 02/02/2006 | Tatsuya Shimoji | 2006_0114A | 7518 |
| 52349 | 7590 | 09/10/2010 | EXAMINER | |
| WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK L.L.P. | | | JOHNS, CHRISTOPHER C | |
| 1030 15th Street, N.W. | | | | |
| Suite 400 East | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| Washington, DC 20005-1503 | | | 3621 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 09/10/2010 | ELECTRONIC |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ddalecki@wenderoth.com
coa@wenderoth.com

Continuation of 5: Applicants' reply has overcome the 35 USC §101 rejection of claim 17 (Paper Number 20100414, ¶6-9), the 35 USC §112 1st Paragraph rejections of claims 19 and 20 (Paper Number 20100414, ¶10-12), and most of the 35 USC §112 2nd Paragraph rejections of claims 16-20 (Paper Number 20100414, ¶15-21). Applicants' reply has also overcome the 35 USC §112 2nd Paragraph rejections of claims 17 and 18 (Paper Number 20100414, ¶22-27).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 16-18 are allowed.

Continuation of 11: does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the rejections of claims 19 and 20 under 35 USC §112 2nd Paragraph still remain.

1. Claim 19 is indefinite because a person having ordinary skill in the art would not understand whether Applicants are claiming the subcombination of a “non-transitory computer-readable recording medium,” or the combination of a “non-transitory computer-readable recording medium” and a “content.”
2. The preamble of claim 19 indicates that the claim is drawn to a “non-transitory computer-readable recording medium” (“A non-transitory computer-readable recording medium...”; page 13, lines 1-2). Furthermore, claim 19 recites limitations of the medium, such as “having a server program recorded thereon, the server program to be executed by a server...” (page 13, lines 2-3).

3. The body of claim 19 positively recites a “non-transitory computer-readable recording medium” in combination with a “content”. See page 13, line 5+, which reads “wherein the content includes: an upper-level resource that is first referred to....”

4. Because the preamble indicates that the claim is drawn to only a “non-transitory computer-readable recording medium”, and the body of the claim is drawn to a “non-transitory computer-readable recording medium” in combination with “content”, the claim is indefinite.

5. If it is Applicants’ intention to claim the combination of a “non-transitory computer-readable recording medium” in combination with a “content”, the preamble of the claim must be amended to indicate that the scope is a combination of a “non-transitory computer-readable recording medium” in combination with a “content”. For example, Applicants could amend the preamble to read “A non-transitory computer-readable recording medium and content....”

6. If it is Applicants’ intention to claim the subcombination of a “non-transitory computer-readable recording medium” alone, then all positive recitations concerning the recited “content” must be removed from the claim. Claim 20 contains a similar recitation and is therefore rejected for similar reasoning.

7. Applicants assert, in the After-Final Remarks of 30 August 2010, that “claims 19 and 20 are essentially directed to method steps” (page 25, lines 11-12). The Examiner disagrees.

a. Claims 19 and 20 are directed to “non-transitory computer-readable recording medium,” as is evidenced by the first line of each of the claims. Because claims 19’s and 20’s preambles are directed to “non-transitory computer-readable recording medium,” and because the body of claims 19 and 20 recite limitations on both a “non-transitory

computer-readable recording medium” and a “content,” the claims are indefinite for the reasons above.